

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No. : 10/828,509  
Filing Date : April 20, 2004  
Inventor : Kishor J. Patel  
Title : Digitally Controlled Modular Valve System  
Examiner : Gerald A. Michalsky  
Art Unit : 3753  
Attorney Docket : KPT-32096(1) (19354.0001)  
Confirmation No. : 4314  
Customer No. : 022202

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**Mailing**

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

**37 CFR 1.8(a)**

☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail

**37 CFR 1.10**

☒ as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No. EV405077886US

**Transmission**

☐ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No. 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Gerald A. Michalsky at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: 8-4-05

Benedette Jackson

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

<b>Introductory Comments</b> begin on:	page 2 of 33
<b>Amended Specification</b> begins on:	page 3 of 33
<b>Amended Claims</b> begin on:	page 14 of 33
<b>Remarks</b> begin on:	page 27 of 33
<b>Conclusion</b> begins on:	page 32 of 33
<b>Extension of Time</b> begins on:	page 33 of 33
<b>Replacement Drawing Sheets</b> are in:	Attachment A (FIGS. 1-17)
<b>New Drawing Sheet</b> is in:	Attachment B (FIGS. 18-20)
<b>Industry Support Sheets</b> are in:	Attachment C

10828509  
232053  
00000089  
BABAHA1  
08/08/2005  
400.00 DA  
100.00 DA  
01 FC:2202  
02 FC:2201

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

After careful review, Applicant hereby responds to a July 6, 2005 non-final Office Action regarding the above-referenced patent application. In view of this Response, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Applicant has **not** added any new matter with this Response and intends the scope of the invention and claims to be the same before and after this Response. Indeed, Applicant only offers this Response to clarify the invention for the Examiner and to assist the Examiner's understanding of the same. More specifically, Applicant has not intended this Response to effectuate a narrowing of the claims, foreclose techniques that are not reasonably foreseeable at this time, or effect the applicability and scope of the Doctrine of Equivalents.